

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-16 remain in the application with claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 having been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-3, 8-11, and 16 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Asami et al. in view of Watanabe.

As previously explained, the intervehicular alarm system of the present invention not only involves the determination of the proximity of the two vehicles but also involves altering the type of alarm that is sounded in the second vehicle. That is, as explained in the present specification, the driver operating the operating unit 10 in the first vehicle is able to select the type of alarm sound to be made. For example, the alarm sound may be a horn, that, is a klaxon, or a voice sound such as "stop", "look out", or the like. Upon making such selection the control means controls the sounds that are produced as the alarm.

The claims have been amended hereby to make it more clear that the user of the first vehicle selects or specifies from a plurality of different types of alarms the actual alarm type to be sounded.

Asami et al. also relates to a communications system for use with automobiles in which information is transmitted between the various automobiles in order to indicate the proximity of the vehicles. Asami et al. is completely silent concerning the selecting of different types of alarms to be sounded and Watanabe is cited for ostensibly showing that

feature.

Watanabe relates to a stereophonic warning apparatus in which a number of speakers are provided that are intended to indicate to the user or driver the proximity of an obstacle. The examiner points to column 1, line 16-20 and column 2, lines 51-57 as disclosing the transmission of one of a different types of alarm sounds. Nevertheless, it is respectfully submitted that no such disclosure is found at those locations. The only thing that Watanabe shows is that the output level of the various speakers is controlled in order to generate a so-called image. There is no indication that any different type of alarm is produced. All that is provided is that the attenuation or output level of the various speakers can be controlled.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even combining Watanabe with Asami et al. the features of the present invention relating to transmitting a different type of alarm sound selected from a plurality of possible different alarm sounds, as in the presently claimed invention, is not found in the combination of references.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 5 and 13 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Asami et al. in view of Watanabe and further in view of Sadler.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 13 depends from independent claim 9, which independent claims for the above-stated reasons are thought to be patentably distinct over the

cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claims 5 and 13 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

It is respectfully submitted that Sadler does not cure the deficiency of Watanabe concerning selecting from different types of alarm sounds.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 6 and 14 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Asami et al. in view of Watanabe and further in view of Reeves.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and claim 14 depends from independent claim 9, which independent claims for the above-stated reasons are thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claims 6 and 14 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

It is respectfully submitted that Reeves does not cure the deficiency of the Watanabe relating to providing different types of alarm sounds.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentably over Asami et al. in view of Watanabe and Reeves and further in view of Hayashida et al.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claim 7 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

It is respectfully submitted that Hayashida et al. does not cure the deficiency of Watanabe concerning transmitting a type of alarm sound to be sounded.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Asami et al. in view of Watanabe and further in view of Hayashida et al.

Claim 15 depends from claim 9, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claim 15 is also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.


Accordingly, in view of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that an intervehicular alarm system, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references, alone or in combination.

The references cited as of interest have been reviewed and are not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

  
Jay H. Maioli  
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:gr